



**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: "That Bylaw No. 9184 be now passed."**

**CARRIED**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2870-30  
Snowdrop Avenue

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2012, NO. 9185"

**PROPOSED TWO LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON SNOWDROP AVENUE**

To rezone Amended Parcel A (DD153664-l), Lots 1 and 2, Section 79, Victoria District, Plan 1318 (**920 SNOWDROP AVENUE**) from Zone RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling-minimum lot size 560m<sup>2</sup>) to Zone RS-4 (Single Family Dwelling-minimum lot size 460m<sup>2</sup>) for a proposed two lot residential subdivision. A **DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT** will also be considered to allow variances for lot width, siting, side yard setbacks, and allowable floor space in non-basement areas. A **COVENANT** will also be considered to further regulate the use of lands and buildings.

The Clerk introduced the following:

- Notice of Public Hearing.
- Report from the Director of Planning dated April 20, 2012 recommending as follows:
  - 1) That the application to rezone from RS-6 to RS-4 be approved;
  - 2) That the Development Variance Permit be approved;
  - 3) That a covenant be registered prior to final reading to require that the design and siting of a new dwelling on proposed Lot B:
    - a) conforms with the plans presented by the applicant, including proposed new fence and hedge; and
    - b) conforms to a minimum EnerGuide 80 or equivalent energy efficiency standard.
- Letter from the applicant dated October 11, 2011 including signatures from residents in support of the application, street view of proposed house, letter dated June 11, 2012 from the applicant submitting an energy audit report for the existing house.
- Letter dated November 1, 2011 from the Residents Association of Strawberry Vale, Marigold and Glanford.
- Four letters from residents.

In response to questions from the Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- It is unlikely that many other lots in this neighbourhood could be subdivided.
- If the existing house on Lot "A" were later removed, any new house would have to comply with the RS-4 zoning requirements.
- The applicant has agreed to provide upgraded insulation in the existing house and this could be secured in the proposed covenant.

**APPLICANT:**

Mr. R. Walker, applicant, provided an overview of the proposed subdivision, the required variances, the energy efficiency features, the consultation process undertaken, the modifications made to ensure privacy for the adjacent property and added:

- He has submitted an energy audit of the existing house and has offered to upgrade the insulation proposed in order to increase the energy efficiency of the building; he is agreeable to including this in the proposed covenant.
- He revisited the design of the new house based on concerns raised by Council regarding the number of variances requested and concluded, with the support of his neighbour to the west and the Saanich Planning Department, that the best design is the one submitted; the drawbacks connected with any alternative design were considerable.
- With respect to traffic and the proposed driveway access, the Engineering Department review concluded any impact would be minimal.
- The problem of traffic congestion in the area is caused by commuters travelling into the city from less expensive housing outside the capital region; this stresses the importance of infill development which can create reasonably-priced housing within established communities, without adding to the traffic problems.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Mr. R. Wegwitz, 3937 Mimosa Place, stated:

- The proposed house does not suit the neighbourhood due to its height.

Mr. A. Molner, 3934 Mimosa Place, stated:

- When new homes are created through infill development, sidewalks should be considered at the same time.

Mr. A. Lidstone, 978 Snowdrop Avenue, stated:

- He is speaking on behalf of his wife and neighbours at 990 Snowdrop Avenue, 485 Montcalm Avenue and 475 Montcalm Avenue.
- This neighbourhood is diverse in lot sizes and house design, with mature trees and gardens and a level of trust among neighbours; its unique character is being steadily eroded due in part to subdivisions with smaller lots and bigger houses.
- Saanich community plans offer a vision of vibrant, distinct neighbourhoods where infill development must be sensitive to the existing character of the neighbourhood, preserving its quality and privacy of dwellings.
- This proposed subdivision is incompatible with Saanich planning goals; it requires downzoning and further variances.

Mr. H. Creek, 972 Snowdrop Avenue, stated:

- He supports new development if it fits within the neighbourhood.
- This house will not affect traffic.
- The nearest neighbour supports the application.

Mr. D. Butcher, Snowdrop Avenue, stated:

- Parked cars on the dangerous curve in Snowdrop Avenue near this proposed subdivision are a safety concern for his young family; it is a blind corner.
- There is also heavy cut through traffic during rush hour.

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

- He lives in the house at 920 Snowdrop Avenue, and does not have a problem exiting the existing driveway; the proposed new driveways will be further from the curve.
- The Saanich Engineering Department did not have a concern about the subdivisions' proximity to the curve in Snowdrop Avenue.

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

In response to questions from the Council, the Development Coordinator stated:

- If it was determined there was a safety hazard at the curve in Snowdrop Avenue, the Engineering Department would consider changing the parking regulations.
- Also the Approving Officer could consider this issue when evaluating the subdivision application.

In response to further questions, the Director of Planning stated:

- Secondary suites would be possible in this area; however, Council could prohibit suites by including that condition in the proposed covenant.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He supports the creation of additional infill lots in the area but the height of the proposed new dwelling is a concern; it does not blend in to the community.
- He does not support the application.

Councillor Wade stated:

- The nearby community supports this application.
- Cut through traffic is a problem in this neighbourhood but is caused mainly by commuters.
- The Approving Officer could consider whether there is a need to prohibit parking on the curve.
- The application has merit and offers an opportunity for families to buy into an affordable neighbourhood in Saanich.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- He had hoped the house could be redesigned and built within the zoning regulations as it presently is not in context with the neighbourhood; it is narrow and high.
- The dangerous curve in the road nearby is a consideration.
- He does not support the application.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The project has desirable environmental features and the neighbourhood is suitable for infill; infill must be tailored to fit in.
- Suites could be prohibited in a covenant if that is a concern.
- Council has limited control over what is built - a much larger home could be constructed on this lot within the zoning.
- The traffic congestion is a regional issue; perhaps the local Community Association could be consulted about initiating a traffic calming project.

**MOTION:                   MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard:  
“That the application to rezone from RS-6 to RS-4 be rejected.”**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Infill housing must be of a sympathetic design; although the height of the proposed dwelling is within the bylaw, the lot size and variances are a concern.
- Perhaps the Planning Department could look at this area and develop a plan to guide future development.
- New sidewalks may be considered in residential neighbourhoods where the pedestrian environment is poor.
- The house does not complement the neighbourhood and could perhaps include a suite.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The applicant carried out a thorough community engagement process.
- Council has limited controls over infill development.
- The proposed house is an awkward fit; its height and size on the lot have been raised as concerns.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She appreciates the green features of the proposed new dwelling but it does not fit within the context of the neighbourhood.
- The lot is next to a dog leg curve in the road which is a safety concern.
- Council might consider prohibiting suites in such a neighbourhood.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED  
Councillor Wade OPPOSED**

2870-30  
Snowdrop Avenue

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2012, NO. 9185”  
Rescindment of First Reading

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That first reading of Bylaw No. 9185 be rescinded.”**

**CARRIED**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2870-30  
Violet Avenue

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2012, NO. 9186”

**PROPOSED TWO FAMILY DWELLING ON VIOLET AVENUE**

To rezone Lot 14, Block 12, Section 78, Victoria District, Plan 1171 (**742 VIOLET AVENUE**) from Zone RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) to Zone RD-1 (Two Family Dwelling) for a proposed two family dwelling. A **DEVELOPMENT PERMIT** will be considered to require the buildings and lands to be constructed and developed in accordance with the plans submitted.

The Clerk introduced the following:

- Notice of Public Hearing.
- Report from the Director of Planning dated April 20, 2012 recommending that the rezoning from RS-6 to RD-1 and the Development Permit be approved.
- Letter from the applicant dated September 14, 2011 enclosing signatures of residents in support of the application.
- Letter dated October 3, 2011 from the Residents Association of Strawberry Vale, Marigold and Glanford.

In response to questions from the Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- New homes built to comply with the BC Building Code, will be very close to achieving a Built Green standard of energy efficiency.
- The applicant has not made a commitment to a Built Green level.
- The proposed heat pumps must adhere to setback requirements for structures and this will be confirmed.

**APPLICANT:**

Mr. E. Ashmore, 433 Vincent Avenue, stated:

- He has owned the property for 59 years and wants to develop it as a duplex for himself and his family.

Mr. B. Phillips, Contractor, stated on behalf of the applicant:

- The proposed duplex will have a double driveway with two single garages; the roadway will be widened, improving safety for drivers and pedestrians.
- Natural gas service is not available on the street; therefore, they are working with City Green to find opportunities for energy savings; they expect to meet or exceed EnerGuide 80.
- The original design included a basement which was inappropriate for the site and has been removed from the project; the dwelling will have an engineered foundation on slab with a gravity feed to the street.

In response to questions from the Council, Mr. Phillips stated:

- The heat pumps have been removed from the project.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Mrs. P. Van't Haaf, 710 Violet Avenue, stated:

- She has lived in the neighbourhood for 64 years.
- She appreciates the proposal, but questions the roof height.
- Megahouses have gone up nearby; she prefers continuity in the neighbourhood.
- The high, narrow houses are not in keeping and will overlook other homes.

**APPLICANT RESPONSE:**

Mr. Phillips stated:

- The proposed dwelling complies with the height requirements of the zoning bylaw.
- The lot is low in front, rising to the rear, with the building set back 25ft from the front lot line.

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

In response to questions from the Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- The height of the house meets the zoning requirement that the midpoint of the roof not exceed 24.6 feet.
- The Development Permit will ensure the house is built in accordance with the plans submitted.

Councillor Derman stated:

- He would like to support the application but cannot without a commitment to energy efficiency.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The proposed dwelling will complement the area.
- By meeting the requirements of the Building Code, the design will almost achieve an EnerGuide 80 standard.

**MOTION:**

**MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:**

- “1) That the application to rezone from RS-6 to RD-1 be approved;**
- 2) That a covenant be registered prior to final reading to require that the new dwelling conform to a minimum EnerGuide 80 or equivalent energy efficiency standard.”**

Councillor Wade stated:

- It is disappointing that the heat pumps have been removed from the project as they offer significant energy savings.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

2870-30  
Violet Avenue

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2012, NO. 9186”

Second and Third Readings

**MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:**

**“That Bylaw No. 9186 be read a second time.”**

**CARRIED**

**MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:**

**“That Bylaw No. 9186 be now passed.”**

**CARRIED**

**MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:**

**“That it be recommended that Council approve Development Permit No. DPR00494 on Lot 14, Block 12, Section 78, Victoria District, Plan 1171 (742 VIOLET AVENUE), as amended to include the revisions to the design proposed by the applicant which will remove the heat pumps and the basement.”**

**CARRIED**

---

Adjournment      On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm.

.....  
ACTING MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK